



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,810	02/05/2004	Rafay Khan	N0187US	5973
37583 7590 05/20/2010 NAVTEQ NORTH AMERICA, LLC 425 West RANDOLPH STREET SUITE 1200, PATENT DEPT CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
QUIETT, CARRAMAH J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2622				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/20/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment(s), filed on 04/28/2010, have been entered and made of record. Claims 25-27 and 31-33 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 04/28/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

For **claim 25**, Applicant asserts that Abram et al. (US 6432778) does not teach or suggest, "...a remotely located map service server including data that indicates whether a landmark is observable from specific geographic coordinates; and if the geographic coordinates associated with at least one of the plurality of pictures are determined to be coordinates from which the landmark is observable based on the data included in the remotely located map service server, receiving data indicating a name of the landmark." In particular, the Applicant states that Abram does not mention data that indicates whether a landmark is observable from specific geographic coordinates. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In col. 6, lines 19-56, Abram teaches "...The digital imaging device also receives location information from a location determination device, such as a GPS (stage 920). The location information received may be, for example, longitudinal and latitudinal coordinates of the location of the camera when the image was acquired. The coordinates may be associated with the file as is (stage 924), in which case the coordinates are simply linked to the image data (stage 926)...The coordinate information may also be used to obtain graphical map information

derived from the map data, supplied to the device on, for example, a replaceable memory cartridge.”

Then in col. 6, lines 38-56, Abram teaches, “*The location coordinates may be compared, for example, to entries in a location data base stored in memory.* The location data base may contain, for example, global location coordinates and alphanumeric place names such as “Orlando, Fla.” or “Manhattan, N.Y.”. If the coordinates do not correspond exactly to any location in the data base (stage 936), the process may default (stage 938). Alternatively, the process may choose multiple entries with coordinates near the given coordinates (stage 940) and display the list of place names to the user (stage 942). If the coordinates correspond to more than one place name, such as “Manhattan, N.Y.” and “*Radio City Music Hall*,” or alphanumeric place name, all entries may be displayed to the user. The user then indicates which of the place names should be associated with the particular image file (stage 944).

Abram teaches data that indicates whether a *landmark is observable from specific geographic coordinates* because: The “location coordinates” of Abram are considered to be the claimed “specific geographic coordinates”. The “entries” (such as “*Radio City Music Hall*”) of Abram are considered to be the claimed “landmark”. Lastly, the comparing (“compared”) of Abram is considered to be the claimed observing (“observable”). Please note that the term “observable” can be used to do an evaluation (comparing) as well as a person viewing an item or obstacle. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a person's view) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van*

Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the rejections to claims 25-27 and 31-33 are respectfully maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carramah J. Quiett whose telephone number is (571)272-7316. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:00 pm, Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571)272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David L. Ometz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2622

/C. J. Q./
Examiner, Art Unit 2622
May 14, 2010